

activity (including biomedical, microbiological, or agricultural research or practices) not expressly prohibited.

Representative GREENWOOD's bill purportedly advances the benefits of "therapeutic cloning"; that is, the cloning of embryos for the purpose of scientific research. While we may hear endless examples of how this technology may lead to advanced cancer therapies, solve infertility problems, and end juvenile diabetes, in reality, not one reputable research organization has provided any hard evidence that cloned embryos will provide any such miracles. To date, not one disease has been cured, or one treatment developed based on this technology. Furthermore, there is abundant evidence that alternatives to this procedure already exist. Stem cells, which can be harvested from placentas and umbilical cords, even from human fat cells, have yielded far more results than embryonic stem cells.

What is most objectionable to the bill is that it will take us in an entirely new and inhumane direction, whereby the United States government will be condoning, indeed encouraging, the creation of embryos for the purpose of destruction.

There is nothing humanitarian or compassionate about creating and destroying human life for some theoretical, technical benefit that is far from established. To create a cloned human embryo solely to harvest its cells is just as abhorrent as cloning a human embryo for implantation.

To not provide an outright and complete ban on embryonic cloning would set a dangerous precedent. Once the Federal government permits such dubious and mischievous research practices, regardless of how strict the guidelines and regulations are drawn, human cloning will undoubtedly occur.

Mr. Speaker, nothing scientifically or medically important would be lost by banning embryonic cloning. Indeed, at this time, there is no clinical, scientific, therapeutic or moral justification for it. I urge all House Members to join a vast majority of American citizens and members of the scientific community in support of H.R. 2505, the true Human Cloning Prohibition Act of 2001.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, it is July 31st, the year 2001. Once upon a time, the discussions about cloning human beings were about a hypothetical point in the future.

America has not paid too much attention to the scientific, legal, and ethical issues surrounding cloning because it was always something so far off in the future that it seemed surreal.

Well, the future is upon us and today we discuss an issue of utmost importance in determining what sort of world we live in.

We all want to secure America's future—to live in a land of prosperity, good health, and great opportunity.

However, our future will very much be shaped by our present decisions and fundamental questions about human life and human identity.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, in support of H.R. 2505—the Weldon/Stupak bill to enact a true ban on human cloning. I rise in opposition to the Greenwood/Deutsch bill which purports to be a ban, but will allow the industrial exploitation of human life.

Mr. Speaker, you and I and every other person on the face of this earth have unique features—things that make us not only human, but individuals.

Our fingerprints are like snowflakes—there is not, nor has there ever been, an exact replica of another human being.

Cloning is a whole new world. What is a clone? Who is close? What is the identity of a clone? Who is responsible for the clone? Why would clones be brought into existence? Should they become human organ farms, created specifically to try to save the life of another human being? Would clones have different rights than 'natural' human beings? Would they be a subservient class of human beings?

Supporters of the Greenwood Substitute might claim that this is far-fetched, that their language has no intention of allowing the creation of actual cloned living, breathing human beings.

As columnist Charles Krauthammer puts so eloquently, "... once the industry of cloning human embryos has begun and thousands are being created, grown, bought and sold, who is going to prevent them from being implanted in a woman and developed into a cloned child?"

Well, Mr. Speaker, I ask at what point do we say NO? At what point do we say that we refuse to walk down that slippery slope?

When do we have the strength to stand up for the wonder of life and human experience and say that we will not allow the creation of cloned human embryos for industrial exploitation?

Krauthammer calls the Greenwood bill "a nightmare and an abomination . . . the launching of the most ghoulish and dangerous enterprise in modern scientific history."

Mr. Speaker, I hope we will all be able to look back on this day—July 31, 2001—and recognize that it was a day in which we affirmed human life and rejected those wishing to exploit life in a most horrific way.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to take those words to heart and reject the Greenwood substitute and vote in favor of the underlying bipartisan bill.

As we work together in this body to secure the future for America, let us march forward on our strongest ideals of hope, democracy, and freedom. Let us show the utmost respect for human life and this human experience which we all share.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2505, the Human Cloning Prohibition Act of 2001.

This bill has an amazingly wide range of support. Opponents of the bill have tried to portray it as a piece of pro-life legislation, and have made it hard for pro-choice members to support it. But anyone who has followed the series of cloning hearings has seen some of the most unusual alliances in recent political history, including many pro-choice activists and organizations who see the common sense in banning the ghoulish practice of cloning. Even they see that embryo cloning will, with virtual certainty, lead to the production of experimental human beings.

Scientists acknowledge the ethical questions cloning raises. As recently as the December 27, 2000 issue of the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, three bioethicists co-authored a major paper on human cloning that freely acknowledged that somatic cell nuclear transfer creates human embryos and noted that it raises complex ethical questions.

Some have stated that life begins in the womb, not a petri dish or a refrigerator. I believe, however, that human life is created

when an egg and a sperm meet. The miracle of life cannot be denied, whether it begins in a womb or a petri dish. Even scientists and bioethicists realize the moral and ethical implications that cloning brings about. Twisting this reality is disingenuous.

Do we really want Uncle Sam cloning human beings? Do we really want the federal government to play God in such an undeniable way? I certainly don't. The Greenwood substitute is a moral and practical disaster, however you look at it. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 2505 and against the Greenwood substitute and the motion to recommit.

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following information on the subject of Cloning.

NATIONAL RIGHT TO LIFE

COMMITTEE, INC.

Washington, DC, July 26, 2001.

SCIENTISTS SAY "THERAPEUTIC CLONING"

CREATES A HUMAN EMBRYO

President Clinton's National Bioethics Advisory Commission, in its 1997 report *Cloning Human Beings*, explicitly stated: "The Commission began its discussions fully recognizing that any effort in humans to transfer a somatic cell nucleus into an enucleated egg involves the creation of an embryo, with the apparent potential to be implanted in utero and developed to term."

The National Institutes of Health Human Embryo Research Panel also assumed in its September 27, 1994 Final Report, that cloning results in embryos. In listing research proposals that "should not be funded for the foreseeable future" because of "serious ethical concerns," the NIH panel included cloning: "Such research includes: . . . Studies designed to transplant embryonic or adult nuclei into an enucleated egg, including nuclear cloning, in order to duplicate a genome or to increase the number of embryos with the same genotype, with transfer."

A group of scientists, ethicists, and biotechnology executives advocating "therapeutic cloning" and use of human embryos for research—Arthur Caplan of the University of Pennsylvania, Lee Silver of Princeton University, Ronald Green of Dartmouth University, and Michael West, Robert Lanza, and Jose Cibelli of Advanced Cell Technology—confirmed in the December 27, 2000 issue of the *Journal of the American Medical Association* that a human embryo is created and destroyed through "therapeutic cloning": "CRNT [cell replacement through nuclear transfer, another term for "therapeutic cloning"] requires the deliberate creation and disaggregation of a human embryo." "... because therapeutic cloning requires the creation and disaggregation ex utero of blastocyst stage embryos, this technique raises complex ethical questions."

On September 7, 2000, the European Parliament adopted a resolution on human cloning. The Parliament's press release defined and commented on "therapeutic cloning": "... 'Therapeutic cloning,' which involves the creation of human embryos purely for research purposes, poses an ethical dilemma and crosses a boundary in research norms."

Lee M. Silver, professor of molecular biology and evolutionary biology at Princeton University, argues in his 1997 book, *Remaking Eden: Cloning and Beyond in a Brave New World*. "Yet there is nothing synthetic about the cells used in cloning. . . . The newly created embryo can only develop inside the womb of a woman in the same way that all embryos and fetuses develop. Cloned children will be full-fledged human beings,